## Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE

## Fifth Appellate District

### F038289 People v. Ouch

Counsel having failed to request oral argument in the aboveentitled case, oral argument is deemed waived in accordance with the provisions of a notice heretofore mailed to counsel and the cause is submitted.

### F038289 People v. Ouch

The judgment is affirmed.

By the Court.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

#### F038504 People v. Mejia

Oral argument having been waived in the above-entitled case in accordance with the provisions of a notice mailed to counsel, the case is submitted for decision.

#### F037337 King v. McDonald Transit Assoc., Inc.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal in the above-entitled action is dismissed. Costs are awarded to McDonald. Wiseman, J.

We concur: Ardaiz, P.J.; Vartabedian, J.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

#### F039531 In re Pablo V., a Minor

Counsel having failed to request oral argument in the aboveentitled case, oral argument is deemed waived in accordance with the provisions of a notice heretofore mailed to counsel and the cause is submitted.

#### F039531 In re Pablo V., a Minor

The orders of the juvenile court are affirmed.

By the Court.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

### F039889 In re John B., a Minor

Counsel having failed to request oral argument in the aboveentitled case, oral argument is deemed waived in accordance with the provisions of a notice heretofore mailed to counsel and the cause is submitted.

# Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE

# Fifth Appellate District

#### F039889 In re John B., a Minor

The judgment is affirmed.

By the Court.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

## F025644 People v. Rangel et al.

The judgment against appellant Rangel on counts 13, 17 and 32 is reversed due to insufficiency of the evidence to support Rangel's convictions on those counts. The matter is remanded to the superior court for resentencing. In all other respects the judgment is affirmed.

The judgment against appellant Liddle is reversed on counts 9, 10, 11, 32, 33, 45, 46, 47 and 48 due to insufficiency of the evidence to support Liddle's convictions on those counts. The matter is remanded to the superior court for resentencing. In all other respects the judgment is affirmed. Ardaiz, P.J.

We concur: Wiseman, J.; Wallace, PRO TEM, J.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

### F040232 People v. Delk

No brief having been filed by appellant after notice duly given under rule 37(b) of the California Rules of Court, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal in the above-entitled action is dismissed.